



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/025,550	12/26/2001	Katsuhiko Suzuki	H07-138280M/NHK	8312
21254	7590	11/28/2005	EXAMINER	
MCGINN INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW GROUP, PLLC 8321 OLD COURTHOUSE ROAD SUITE 200 VIENNA, VA 22182-3817			DOTE, JANIS L.	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1756	

DATE MAILED: 11/28/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/025,550

Applicant(s)

SUZUKI ET AL.

Examiner

Janis L. Dote

Art Unit

1756

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 September 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 7, 8, 27 and 34-39 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 7, 8, 27, and 34-39 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 24 November 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                        | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)    | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____  |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

Art Unit: 1756

1. The examiner acknowledges the amendments to claims 1, 2, and 34, and the addition of claims 35-39 set forth in the amendment filed on Sep. 16, 2005. Claims 1-4, 7, 8, 27, and 34-39 are pending.

2. The rejection of claims 1-4, 7, 8, and 27 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over US 5,923,933 (Anzai) combined with Japanese Patent 2000-267338 (JP'338), set forth in the office action mailed on Jun. 16, 2005, paragraph 7, has been withdrawn in response to the amendments to claims 1 and 2 set forth in the amendment filed on Sep. 16, 2005. Amended claims 1 and 2 positively recite a step of controlling the stress to a two-component developing agent, which consists mainly of toners and magnetic carriers, between the first and second developing rollers and a developing agent distribution member by selecting a shape coefficient SF2 of the toner particles in said toners to be within a predetermined range to restrict an occurrence of photographic fog, where the SF2 satisfies the relationship  $110 \leq SF2 \leq 130$ . For all of the reasons discussed by applicants in their response filed on Sep. 16, 2005, the references do not teach the stress controlling steps recited in instant claims 1 and 2, and in new claims 36, 38 and 39.

Art Unit: 1756

The rejection of claims 1-4, 7, 8, 27, and 34 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over US 5,630,201 (Suzuki) combined with Diamond, Handbook of Imaging Materials, pp. 160-161, and Fig. 4.1 (Diamond), and US 6,096,468 (Ohno), set forth set forth in the office action mailed on Jun. 16, 2005, paragraph 8, has been withdrawn in response to the amendments to claims 1 and 2 set forth in the amendment filed on Sep. 16, 2005, as described supra. For all of the reasons discussed by applicants in their response filed on Sep. 16, 2005, the references do not teach the stress controlling step recited in instant claims 1 and 2, and in new claims 36, 38, and 39.

3. Applicant is advised that should claims 27 and 34 be found allowable, claims 38 and 39 will be objected to under 37 CFR 1.75 as being substantial duplicates thereof. When two claims in an application are duplicates or else are so close in content that they both cover the same thing, despite a slight difference in wording, it is proper after allowing one claim to object to the other as being a substantial duplicate of the allowed claim. See MPEP § 706.03(k).

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

Art Unit: 1756

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

5. Claims 1-4, 7, 8, 27, and 34-39 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Independent claims 1, 2, 36, 38, and 39 are indefinite in the phrase "image method comprising: in a center feed developing system . . . and using a two-component developing agent consisting mainly of said toners and magnetic carriers" (emphasis added). The phrase "said toners and magnetic carriers" lacks antecedent basis in claims 1, 2, 36, 38, and 39. Claims 1, 2, 36, 38, and 39 do not previously recite the use of "toners and magnetic carriers." Those claims previously recite "[a]n image forming method comprising:".

Claims 1, 2, 36, 38, and 39 are also indefinite in the phrase "controlling a stress to said developing agent between said first and second developing rollers and a developing agent distributing member" (emphasis added) for lack of unambiguous antecedent basis for the term "a developing agent distributing member" (emphasis added). It is not clear whether "a developing agent distributing member" (emphasis added) refers to the

Art Unit: 1756

previously recited "developing agent distributing member formed between said first and second developing rollers" or to another distributing member.

In the response filed on Sep. 8, 2005, page 12, second paragraph, and the paragraph bridging pages 15 and 16, applicants refer to "a recording sheet" as a "cut sheet," e.g., a piece of paper, as opposed to a continuous sheet as recited in amended instant claims 1 and 2 and new claims 38 and 39. In view of applicants' representations, claims 1, 2, 38, and 39 are indefinite in the phrase "fixing said toner image transferred onto said recording medium to thereby form a recorded image on a recording sheet" (emphasis added) because it is not clear how a toner image on a continuous sheet can become a fixed toner on a recording sheet, which is not a continuous sheet, but in applicants' words "a cut sheet."

Claims 1, 2, 38, and 39 are also indefinite in the twice recited phrase "said two-component magnetic developing agent" (emphasis added) for lack of antecedent basis for "magnetic" developing agent. Claims 1 and 2 previously recite a two-component developing agent, not a two-component magnetic developing agent.

Claims 34 and 39 are indefinite in the phrase "center feed developing system comprises a high speed printer." Claim 1, from

Art Unit: 1756

which claim 34 is depends, and claim 39 previously recite that the center feed developing system comprises two developing rollers and a developing agent distributing member. The originally filed specification at page 8, lines 3-4, discloses that the "center feed developing system is employed in the high-speed printing." In other words, the center feed developing system is a component of a high speed printer. It does not contain the printer. It is not clear how a component of a printer contains the printer.

Claim 36 is indefinite in the phrase "scraping said developing agent . . . from said first developing roller using a scraper, said scraper delivering said scraped developing agent to a stirring member" (emphasis added) for lack of unambiguous antecedent basis for "said scraper delivering." Claim 36 merely recites scraping the developing agent from the first roller. Claim 36 does not recite that the scraping step is also a delivering step.

Claim 37 is indefinite in the phrase "controlling an effectiveness of a cleaner . . . in cleaning said toners from said photosensitive body by selecting said shape coefficient SF1 of said toners to be within a predetermined range" (emphasis added) for lack of unambiguous antecedent basis for the term "a cleaner" and the term "a predetermined range." It is not clear

Art Unit: 1756

whether "a cleaner" refers to the recited "cleaning brush" in claim 36, from which claim 37 depends, or to another cleaner.

It is also not clear whether "a predetermined range" of SF1 in claim 37 refers to a toner having a SF1 in a range from 120 to 170 recited in instant claim 36, or to another range.

6. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

7. Claims 1-4, 7, 8, 27, and 34-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

(1) Claims 1, 2, 38, and 39 and claims dependent thereon recite that the toner image is transferred onto a "recording medium which comprises a continuous sheet."



Art Unit: 1756

The originally filed specification does not provide an adequate written description of the recording medium comprising a continuous sheet as recited in the instant claims. The originally filed specification at page 8, lines 8-11, and at page 19-20, merely discloses "transferring the toner image onto a recording medium; and, fixing the toner image transferred on the recording medium to thereby form a recorded image on a recording sheet" (emphasis added). The originally filed specification at page 15, lines 2-7, discloses that in Figure 1, "a recording sheet 14 is delivered by registration rollers 15, 16 and the toner image on the photosensitive body 1 is transferred to the recording sheet 14 by the transfer device 17" (emphasis added). In applicants' words, a "recording sheet" refers to "a cut sheet." See the response filed on Sep. 8, 2005, page 12, second paragraph, and the paragraph bridging pages 15 and 16. In their response, applicants distinguish a recording sheet as a "cut sheet," e.g., a piece of paper, from the continuous sheet recited in the instant claims. There is, however, no disclosure in the originally filed specification of a "continuous sheet" as recited in the instant claims.

(2) Claims 34 and 39 recite that the peripheral speed ( $V_p$ ) of the image carrier is "at least 1800 mm/sec."

Art Unit: 1756

The originally filed specification does not provide an adequate written description of the recited image carrier peripheral speed. The originally filed specification at page 16, line 5, discloses that the results shown in Figs. 5 and 6 were obtained with a photosensitive body, i.e., image carrier, peripheral speed of 1800 mm/sec. The originally filed specification does not disclose that the photosensitive body is rotated at a peripheral speed of "at least 1800 mm/sec." The claim language "at least 1800 mm/sec" is broader than the disclosed single peripheral speed of 1800 mm/sec because it includes peripheral speeds greater than 1800 mm/sec.

(3) Claim 35 recites that the "peripheral speed ( $V_{m1}$ ) of said first developing roller [is] in the range from 1440mm/s to 3600mm/s, and said peripheral speed ( $V_{m2}$ ) of said second developing roller [is] in the range from 1890mm/s to 3600mm/s."

The originally filed specification does not provide an adequate written description of said peripheral speeds  $V_{m1}$  and  $V_{m2}$ . The originally filed specification at page 16, line 5, discloses that the results shown in Figs. 5 and 6 were obtained with a photosensitive body, i.e., an image carrier, having a peripheral speed of 1800 mm/sec. The originally filed specification does not disclose the speed ratios recited in the instant claim. The originally filed specification only

Art Unit: 1756

discloses that the peripheral speed ratio ( $S1 = Vm1/Vp$ ) between the peripheral speed ( $Vm1$ ) of the first developing roller and the peripheral speed ( $Vp$ ) of the image carrier is set in the range of 0.8-2.0, and the peripheral speed ratio ( $S2 = Vm2/Vp$ ) between the peripheral speed ( $Vm2$ ) of the second developing roller and the peripheral speed ( $Vp$ ) of the image carrier is set in the range of 1.05-2.0. See the originally filed specification at page 8, line 17, to page 9, line 3; page 10, lines 5-15; and page 22, lines 5-13. If peripheral speed of the image carrier  $Vp$  is set to 1800 mm/s, then based on the disclosed ratios  $S1$  and  $S2$ , the peripheral speed ( $Vm1$ ) of the first developing roller can range from 1400 to 3600 mm/s, and the peripheral speed ( $Vm2$ ) of the second developing roller can range from 1890 to 3600 mm/s. The peripheral speed limitations recited in instant claim 35 are broader than the disclosure in the originally filed specification, because they not limit to situations where the image carrier has a peripheral speed of 1800 mm/s, but encompasses situations where the image carrier has a peripheral speed of not 1800 mm/s.

(4) Claims 36 and 37 recite a method that does not require that the first and second developing rollers are rotatable in mutually opposite directions; that the moving direction of the first developing roller is opposite to the moving direction of

Art Unit: 1756

the image carrier in a developing area; that the moving direction of the second developing roller is the same as the moving direction of the image carrier; that the peripheral speed ratios ( $S1 = Vm1/Vp$ ) between the peripheral speed ( $Vm1$ ) of the first developing roller and the peripheral speed ( $Vp$ ) of the image carrier is set in the range of 0.8 - 2.0; and the peripheral speed ratios ( $S2 = Vm2/Vp$ ) between the peripheral speed ( $Vm2$ ) of the second developing roller and the peripheral speed ( $Vp$ ) of the image carrier is set in the range of 1.05 - 2.0.

The originally filed specification does not provide an adequate written description of the image forming method recited in instant claims 36 and 37. The originally filed specification discloses that its invention, an image forming method, comprises the step of developing the latent image on the image carrier by supplying toners to said image carrier by first and second developing rollers where the first and second developing rollers are "rotatable in mutually opposite directions" and "characterized in that the moving direction of the first developing roller is opposite to the moving direction of the image carrier in a developing area, and a peripheral speed ratios ( $S1 = Vm1/Vp$ ) between the peripheral speed ( $Vm1$ ) of the first developing roller and the peripheral speed ( $Vp$ ) of the

Art Unit: 1756

image carrier is set in the range of 0.8 - 2.0; the moving direction of the second developing roller is the same as the moving direction of the image carrier, and the peripheral speed ratios ( $S2 = Vm2/Vp$ ) between the peripheral speed ( $Vm2$ ) of the second developing roller and the peripheral speed ( $Vp$ ) of the image carrier is set in the range of 1.05 - 2.0." Originally filed specification, page 8, line 16, to page 9, line 3; page 9, line 22, to page 11, line 15; and page 22, lines 1-13. Also see originally filed claims 1 and 2. Instant claims 36 and 37 fail to recite that the first and second developing rollers rotate in mutually opposite directions; the disclosed first and second developing rollers directional motions with respect to the image carrier; and the disclosed peripheral speed ratios  $S1$  and  $S2$ . The originally filed specification also discloses that the prevention of stress is accomplished when the first and second developing rollers rotate at peripheral speed ratios  $S1$  and  $S2$  in the range of 0.8 to 2.0 and of 1.05 to 2.0, respectively, and when the developing step uses a developing agent consisting mainly of a toner and magnetic carrier, where the toner has the shape coefficient  $SF2$  in the range of 110 to 130. Originally filed specification, page 19, line 21, to page 21, line 10. The originally filed specification distinguishes its invention by teaching that there are adverse consequences when the peripheral

Art Unit: 1756

ratios S1 and S2 are outside the disclosed ranges. See the originally filed specification, page 16, line 24, to page 17, line 5, page 17, lines 17-19, and Figs. 7 and 8. There is no disclosure in the originally filed specification of preventing stress as recited in the instant claims in a method that does not comprise first and second developing rollers that are rotating at the peripheral speed ratios S1 and S2 disclosed in the originally filed specification, and a developing agent consisting mainly of a toner and magnetic carrier where the toner has a shape coefficient SF2 of 110-130. The method recited in instant claims 36 and 37 is broader than the originally disclosed method because it encompasses methods that do not require the following: (1) that the first and second developing rollers rotate in mutually opposite directions; (2) the disclosed first and second developing rollers directional motions with respect to the image carrier; and (3) the disclosed the peripheral speed ratios S1 and S2. For example, such methods include image methods where the first and second developing rollers are rotated in the same directions, or methods where the first and second developing rollers do not satisfy the disclosed peripheral speed ratios S1 and S2. Accordingly, the originally filed specification does not

Art Unit: 1756

describe the image forming method broadly recited in the instant claims.

(5) Claims 36 and 37 also recite the use of "said scraper delivering said scraped developing agent to a stirring member."

The originally filed specification does not provide an adequate written description of the delivering step broadly recited in instant claims 36 and 37. The originally filed specification discloses that the developing agent scraped off the first developing roller is combined with "toners supplied from a toner feed roller" and "then supplied and delivered onto screw-shaped stirring members 11, 12, which are disposed in the lower portion of the developing device 4." The step recited in the instant claims is broader than the disclosed step because it encompasses steps that do not deliver both toners supplied from a toner supply roller and the scraped-off developing agent, and steps that do not use two screw-shaped members disposed in a lower portion of a developing device.

(6) Claim 36 recites the use of a "cleaning brush."

The originally filed specification does not provide an adequate written description of the "cleaning brush" broadly recited in instant claim 36. The originally filed specification at page 15, lines 11-12, discloses the use of a cleaner that "includes a fur brush . . . that can rotate in contact with the

Art Unit: 1756

photosensitive body" (emphasis added). The cleaning brush recited in instant claim 36 is broader than the disclosed fur brush, because it encompasses cleaning brushes that are not a fur brush, such as brush comprising polyester bristles.

(7) Claim 37 recites "controlling an effectiveness of a cleaner in said carrier . . . in cleaning said toners from said photosensitive body by selecting said shape coefficient SF1 of said toners to be within a predetermined range" (emphasis added).

The originally filed specification does not provide an adequate written description of the "cleaner" broadly recited in instant claim 37. The originally filed specification at page 15, lines 11-12, discloses the use of a cleaner that "includes a fur brush . . . that can rotate in contact with the photosensitive body." The term "a cleaner" recited in instant claim 37 is broader than the disclosed fur brush, because it encompasses cleaners that are not fur brushes, such as cleaning blades.

Furthermore, in the event that the term "predetermined range" of the SF1 of the toners recited in instant claim 37 does not refer to a toner having a SF1 in a range from 110 to 130 recited in instant claim 36, from which claim 37 depends, claim 37 is rejected as follows:



The originally filed specification does not provide an adequate written description of controlling the effectiveness of a cleaner as recited in the instant claims. The originally filed specification at page 18, line 18, discloses that the coefficient SF1 of the toners is set to range from 120 to 170. The originally filed specification at page 20, lines 9-14, discloses that "in the case the coefficient SF1 deviates from the above range . . . the cleaning characteristic of the toner image formed . . . [is] not sufficient." The recited SF1 predetermined range recited in instant claim 37 is broader than the disclosed SF1 range of 120 to 170, because it encompasses SF1 values that are outside the range of 120 to 170.

(8) In the event that the term "a developing agent distributing member" in the phrase "controlling a stress to said developing agent between said first and second developing rollers and a developing agent distributing member" (emphasis added) does not refer to the previously recited "developing agent distributing member formed between said first and second developing rollers, claims 1, 2, 36, 38, and 39 are rejected as follows:

The originally filed specification does not provide an adequate written description of said stress controlling step recited in the instant claims. The originally filed

Art Unit: 1756

specification at page 20, line 23, to page 21, line 10, discloses that "when the toners pass through the developing agent distributing member **8** and through between the developing rollers **61, 62**, due to the poor fluidity of the toners, the stress to be applied to the developing agent becomes excessively large . . . in the case where stress becomes excessively large, the spent [toners fused and adhered to the magnetic carrier surfaces] occurrence speed increases" (emphasis added). The specification at page 21, lines 5-9, discloses that large toner spent gives rise to the occurrence of photographic fog. In other words, the specification appears to disclose that the "poor fluidity of the toner" increases the "stress" applied to the developing agent as the developing agent passes through the "developing agent distributing member **8** and through between the developing rollers **61, 62**" (emphasis added), which thereby increases toner spent. In Fig. 1, the developing agent distributing member **8** is formed between the two developing rollers. The stress controlling step recited in the instant claims is broader than the disclosed step because it encompasses controlling steps where the developing agent distributing member is not formed between the two developing rollers.

Art Unit: 1756

Applicants' arguments filed on Sep. 25, 2005, with respect to items (1) and (2) above have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

(1) Applicants assert that the "one of ordinary skill in the art would easily understand from Figure 1 of the Application that the claimed invention is intended to transfer the toner image on to a recording medium which includes a continuous sheet since an exemplary aspect of the claimed invention does not necessary include a neutralization device for separating a sheet nor an erase lamp located on a backside of the transcriber for separating a recording sheet from a drum."

Applicants' comments do not address the rejection, which was made for lack of written description, not enablement. For the reasons discussed in item (1) above, Figure 1 does not show a continuous sheet. Furthermore, applicants' assertion is mere attorney argument. For the reasons discussed in item (1), the originally filed specification does not provide an adequate written description for the continuous sheet recited in the instant claims.

(2) Applicants assert that it is clear from the disclosure at page 17, lines 6-17, of the specification, that "the desirable effects of the claimed invention can be obtained for a

Art Unit: 1756

speed  $V_p$  of the photosensitive body which is greater than 1800 mm/s.

However, the disclosure at page 17, lines 6-17, merely refers to situations where the peripheral ratio  $S_1$  is not 1.3, such as smaller than 0.8. The originally filed specification at page 17 does not disclose that the smaller values of  $S_1$  were evaluated at image carrier peripheral speeds  $V_p$  greater than 1800 mm/s as asserted by applicants. The peripheral ratio  $S_1$  is a ratio of the peripheral speed of the first developing roller ( $V_{m1}$ ) to the peripheral speed of the image carrier  $V_p$ . To satisfy the ratio  $S_1$ , both peripheral speeds  $V_{m1}$  and  $V_p$  can be adjusted, not just the speed of the image carrier. For the reasons discussed in item (2), the rejection stands.

8. Applicants' amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicants are reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

Art Unit: 1756

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Janis L. Dote whose telephone number is (571) 272-1382. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mr. Mark Huff, can be reached on (571) 272-1385. The central fax phone number is (571) 273-8300.

Any inquiry regarding papers not received regarding this communication or earlier communications should be directed to Supervisory Application Examiner Ms. Claudia Sullivan, whose telephone number is (571) 272-1052.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

JLD  
Nov. 20, 2005

*Janis L. Dote*  
JANIS L. DOTE  
PRIMARY EXAMINER  
GROUP 1500  
1700